



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

January 15, 2004

Mr. Martin H. Zelinsky  
Attorney  
Department of Information Resources  
P. O. Box 13564  
Austin, Texas 78711-3564

OR2004-0332

Dear Mr. Zelinsky:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 194185.

The Texas Department of Information Resources (the "department") received a request for a copy of the proposals submitted by IBM Corporation ("IBM"), Tier Technologies, Inc. ("Tier"), and Sierra Systems Group ("Sierra") for the Crash Records Information System RFO, DIR-405-CRIS. Although you take no position with respect to the release of the requested proposals, you claim that the requested proposals may contain proprietary information subject to exception under the Public Information Act (the "Act"). You state, and provide documentation showing, that you have notified third parties IBM, Tier, and Sierra of the request and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why information pertaining to each third party should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (determining that statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception to disclosure under Act in certain circumstances). We have received correspondence from Tier. We have reviewed Tier's arguments and all of the submitted information.

We note that an interested third party is allowed ten business days after the date of its receipt of the governmental body's notice under section 552.305(d) to submit its reasons, if any, as to why requested information relating to that party should be withheld from disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, neither IBM nor Sierra has submitted any comments to this office explaining how release of the requested information

would affect their proprietary interests. Thus, we have no basis to conclude that IBM or Sierra has a protected proprietary interest in any of the submitted information. *See Gov't Code § 551.110(b)* (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial information, party must show by specific factual or evidentiary material, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that it actually faces competition and that substantial competitive injury would likely result from disclosure); *Open Records Decision Nos. 639 at 4 (1996), 552 at 5 (1990)* (party must establish prima facie case that information is trade secret), *542 at 3 (1990)*. Thus, the submitted information related to IBM and Sierra must be released.

Tier argues that portions of its information are excepted under section 552.110 of the Government Code. This section protects the proprietary interests of private parties by excepting from disclosure two types of information: (1) “[a] trade secret obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision,” and (2) “commercial or financial information for which it is demonstrated based on specific factual evidence that disclosure would cause substantial competitive harm to the person from whom the information was obtained.” *See Gov't Code § 552.110(a)-(b)*.

The Texas Supreme Court has adopted the definition of a “trade secret” from section 757 of the Restatement of Torts, which holds a “trade secret” to be

any formula, pattern, device or compilation of information which is used in one's business, and which gives him an opportunity to obtain an advantage over competitors who do not know or use it. It may be a formula for a chemical compound, a process of manufacturing, treating or preserving materials, a pattern for a machine or other device, or a list of customers. It differs from other secret information in a business . . . in that it is not simply information as to a single or ephemeral event in the conduct of the business . . . . A trade secret is a process or device for continuous use in the operation of the business . . . . [It may] relate to the sale of goods or to other operations in the business, such as a code for determining discounts, rebates or other concessions in a price list or catalogue, or a list of specialized customers, or a method of bookkeeping or other office management.

Restatement of Torts § 757 cmt. b (1939); *see also Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763, 776 (Tex. 1958), *cert. denied*, 358 U.S. 898 (1958). If the governmental body takes no position on the application of the “trade secrets” component of section 552.110 to the information at issue, this office will accept a private party's claim for exception as valid under that component if that party establishes a prima facie case for the exception, and no one submits an argument that rebuts the claim as a matter of law.<sup>1</sup> *See Open Records*

---

<sup>1</sup>The Restatement of Torts lists the following six factors as indicia of whether information constitutes a trade secret:

Decision No. 552 at 5 (1990). The private party must provide information that is sufficient to enable this office to conclude that the information at issue qualifies as a trade secret under section 552.110(a). *See* Open Records Decision No. 402 at 3 (1983).

Section 552.110(b) requires a specific factual or evidentiary showing, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that substantial competitive injury would likely result from release of the information at issue. *See* Open Records Decision No. 661 at 5-6 (1999) (business enterprise must show by specific factual evidence that release of information would cause it substantial competitive harm).

Tier asserts that its staff names, project plan, client references and contact information, and sample deliverables should be withheld from disclosure. Having considered all of Tier's arguments and reviewed the submitted information, we conclude that the department must withhold portions of this information under section 552.110. We have marked that information accordingly. We otherwise find that Tier has not established that any of the remaining information qualifies as a trade secret under section 552.110(a). Likewise, Tier has not adequately demonstrated, for purposes of section 552.110(b), that the release of any of the remaining information would cause Tier any substantial competitive harm. Therefore, none of the remaining information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110. *See also* Open Records Decision Nos. 509 at 5 (1988) (because costs, bid specifications, and circumstances would change for future contracts, assertion that release of bid proposal might give competitor unfair advantage on future contracts was entirely too speculative), 319 at 3 (1982) (statutory predecessor to section 552.110 generally not applicable to information relating to organization and personnel, market studies, professional references, qualifications and experience, and pricing).

Lastly, we note that some of the submitted information is protected by copyright. A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception to disclosure applies to the information. *See* Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987). An officer for public information must comply with the copyright law, however, and is not required to furnish copies of records that are copyrighted. *Id.* If a member of the public wishes to make copies of copyrighted materials, he or she must do so unassisted by the governmental body. In making copies, the member of the public assumes the duty of

- 
- (1) the extent to which the information is known outside of [the company];
  - (2) the extent to which it is known by employees and other involved in [the company's] business;
  - (3) the extent of measures taken by [the company] to guard the secrecy of the information;
  - (4) the value of the information to [the company] and [its] competitors;
  - (5) the amount of effort or money expended by [the company] in developing the information;
  - (6) the ease or difficulty with which the information could be properly acquired or duplicated by others.

Restatement of Torts § 757 cmt. b (1939); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 2 (1982), 306 at 2 (1982), 255 at 2 (1980).

compliance with the copyright law and the risk of a copyright infringement suit. *See Open Records Decision No. 550 at 8-9 (1990).*

In summary, the department must withhold the information related to Tier which we have marked. The department must release the remaining submitted information in compliance with copyright law.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or

complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



Sarah I. Swanson  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

SIS/lmt

Ref: ID# 194185

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Bill Rogers  
BearingPoint, Inc.  
111 Congress Avenue, Ste. 1100  
Austin, TX 78701-4054  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. James Weaver  
President  
Tier Technologies, Inc.  
2001 North Main Street, Ste. 500  
Walnut Creek, CA 94596  
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Amy Thomas Gerling  
IBM Corporation  
400 West 15<sup>th</sup> Street  
Austin, TX 78701  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Steve Harmon  
Sierra Systems Group, Inc.  
433 East Las Colinas Blvd., Ste. 900  
Irving, TX 75039  
(w/o enclosures)